

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's withdrawal of the restriction requirement and the allowance of claims 1-3, 5-28, and 32-34.

Claims 29-31 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) based on newly-cited USP 6,080,606 to Gleskova. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, the rejection is not properly made on under 35 USC §102(b). The present application is a continuation of an application which has a PCT filing date that well precedes the issue date of Gleskova. For purposes of this response, the rejection is assume to be under 35 USC §102(e).

Claim 29 recites a method of producing a backplane having an array of electrical or electronic elements. The processes for making the electronic elements are also used simultaneously to form parts of spacers in the backplane. The spacers are laterally spaced from the electronic elements. Gleskova teaches a method of producing a thin film transistor (TFT). But there is no description of a spacer. Nevertheless, the Examiner seems to be saying that part of the transistor structure acts as a spacer to space the top of the TFT away from the substrate.

The Examiner points to the toner masks in Figures 1A-1C as allegedly showing an array of electrical or electronic elements, amorphous silicon layer 10 and and gate insulator layer 12 in Figure 2D allegedly showing the claimed spacers, and Figure 2L as

allegedly showing the layers 10 and 12 being laterally spaced from the electronic elements.

But Figures 2A-2L of Gleskova show the processing steps in making one thin film transistor, i.e., a single electrical or electronic element. See col. 2, lines 45-47. A single finished transistor is clearly not an array of electrical or electronic elements. In the rejection of claim 31, the Examiner reveals that he considers layers 10 and 12 to be a spacer between the substrate 2 and pad 22. What constitutes the electronic elements? Moreover, how are layers 10 and 12 laterally-spaced from the electrical element?

In any event, claim 29 has been amended using wording from allowed claim 1 to make it clear that the spacer is separate from the electronic elements and that the spacer rises higher over the backplane than the electronic elements. The combination of features recited in claim 29 is not disclosed in Gleskova.

Having responded to all objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Official Action, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. In the event the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

CROSSLAND et al  
Appl. No. 10/084,652  
December 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:



John R. Lastova  
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:maa  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100